DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 603 EC 132 888

AUTHOR Maples, Wayne: And Others
TITLE Evaluation of the Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Centers at William B. Carrell, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Dallas Independent School District, Tex.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Construction Industry: Demography: *Disabilities: Homemaking Skills: *Job Skills: *Magnet Schools: Maintenance: Program Descriptions: Program Evaluation: Secondary Education: *Vocational Education: *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Multiple Careers Magnet Center TX

ABSTRACT

The report evaluates Texas' Multiple Careers Magnet Center (MCMC), a part time program to provide special education secondary students with career training. It is explained that students enter one of six career education clusters: furniture repair and upholstery, general construction trades, building and grounds maintenance, laundry and dry cleaning, and home and community services. Results focus on the MCMC student body (demographic information): faculty demographics: curricular experiences (cluster activities for the six occupational areas): transportation arrangements: quality of student individualized education programs: student, parent, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC: and student academic achievement. Attitudes of families, faculty, and students toward the program were highly favorable. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED203603

Evaluation of the Multiple Careers Magnet and Assessment Centers at William B. Carrell, 1978-79

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wayne Maples
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Evaluators: Wayne Maples
Karen Cortell Reisman
Jenci Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy
Wayne R. Murray

Objectives of the Programs: The Multiple Careers Magnet Center (MCMC) is a part-time magnet school designed to provide special education students at the secondary level with career training. Students enter one of six career education clusters for three consecutive quarters. The objectives for each career cluster follow:

Furniture Repair and Upholstery. Students learn to repair frames and rebuild legs and spindles, etc., as needed. Training on woodworking equipment toward this purpose is provided. In addition, students learn how to upholster and refinish furniture.

General Construction Trades. Students learn techniques necessary for the construction of new buildings. Coursework includes cement work, bricklaying, carpentry, cabinetmaking, and electrical wiring. A student may remain in this program for the full three quarters or may identify a particular area of interest and skill and be transferred to a regular program (e.g., bricklaying). Students in this class will construct small prefabricated storage units.

Building and Grounds Maintenance. Emphasis is on teaching the student basic maintenance techniques for home and industry and the surrounding grounds. Students learn how to clean and wax floors, clean restrooms, make basic electrical and plumbing repairs, install window panes and learn the proper care and maintenance of landscaped areas.

Laundry and Dry Cleaning. Students are provided with the latest equipment and methods necessary for employment in the laundry and dry cleaning industry. The object of the dry cleaning course is to give the student a firm grounding in the knowledge of different fabrics in the process of dry cleaning and pressing.

Home and Community Services. Of two separate labs offered, one emphasizes food preparation while the other emphasizes commercial sewing and housekeeping. Students are provided training experiences in food service, clothing service, housekeeping management service and laundry service. After initial training students may select an area of specialized training.

FC 132888

Since the MCMC is a part-time magnet, students attend either morning or afternoon, spending the remainder of the day in their home school. Upon completion of three quarters at the MCMC, students may opt to (a) continue in the program, (b) receive training in a related career program in another DISD secondary school, (c) participate in on-the-job training, or (d) be placed on a job.

The Assessment Center shares the William B. Carrell facility. It is available to any special education student at the secondary level when there is some uncertainty about a career choice. The assessment is designed to help students, their parents, and others who are assisting the students, plan for realistic careers in which they are most likely to succeed. The vocational assessment is an evaluation of work values, vocational interests and aptitudes, as well as attitudes toward work and social skills. Assessment techniques include work samples, interviews, and interest and aptitude inventories. Throughout the assessment process, counselors give feedback so that students can become aware of their own strengths and interests and are therefore better able to make realistic career decisions. When students are recommended for extended assessment (beyond three weeks), they move into a special education resource room for career exploration or work adjustment. At the conclusion of assessment, recommendations for vocational training and/or employment are made.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The primary purpose of the evaluation was to collect and disseminate program information to project management as an aid for decision-making following the first two quarters of operation. Context data reported for the MCMC and Assessment Center included the characteristics of the students and staff. Whenever possible, the student characteristics were compared to the characteristics of all special education students who were potential clients of the MCMC and Assessment Center. A second context question involved examining the characteristics of the Advisory Committee for the MCMC. Process data concerned (a) what curricular experiences were available at the MCMC, (b) whether the Individual Educational Programs (IEP) were completed and instructionally functional for all MCMC students, and (c) whether there were any problems in the transportation of students to the MCMC and Assessment Center. Product data were gathered on student, parent, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC as well as the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and Assessment Center. The final evaluation question concerned the administrative tasks and/or procedures used to initiate the MCMC and Assessment Center. This information was intended to provide feedback for project management.

Sample: All students and instructors at the MCMC and Assessment Center were included in the context evaluation. The DISD Special Education data base served as the main source of student information. All instructional staff members and assessment counselors completed demographic information sheets. Site observations and interviews with all vocational instructors were used to determine which curricular experiences were available at the

MCMC. The MCMC Student Interview Form was used to interview 28 randomly selected students concerning attitudes toward the MCMC and transportation problems. The MCMC Parent Interview Form was used in a telephone survey of 20 randomly selected parents concerning attitudes toward the MCMC and transportation problems. A 15-item questionnaire was disseminated with an enclosed self-addressed envelope to 158 area professionals, local professionals, and vocational teachers to determine the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and Assessment Center. The IEP Checklist for MCMC Students was used in a random sample of 30 student's IEPs.

Evaluation Design: The context portion of the evaluation included two questions:

1. What were the demographic characteristics of students and faculty at the MCMC and Assessment Center?

2. What were the characteristics of the Advisory Committee for the MCMC?

Demographic information collected for students included sex, ethnicity, grade, age, home school, career cluster, and handicap. Information collected on the faculty included sex, ethnicity, age, degree, and teaching and/or professional experience. Information concerning the Advisory Committee was obtained from management during May, 1979.

The process portion of the evaluation included questions regarding the characteristics of the instructional programs and transportation difficulties:

3. What curricular experiences were available at the MCMC?

4. What problems, if any, were observed or reported in the transportation of students to the MCMC and Assessment Center?

5. Were the Individual Educational Programs (IEP) completed and instructionally functional for all MCMC students?

Curricular experiences were obtained from site observations and instructor interviews during May, 1979. Transportation problems were investigated via interviews with project management, personnel, and parents during April-May, 1979. The IEP Checklist for MCMC Students was used to evaluate the completeness and technical quality of the IEP objectives. On-site observations, teacher interviews, and interviews with the MCMC counselor were used to verify whether the IEPs were instructionally functional.

The product portion of the evaluation focused on attitudes:

6. What were MCMC students, parents, and faculty attitudes toward the MCMC?

7. What were the attitudes of DISD appraisal and vocational personnel toward the MCMC and the Assessment Center?

Students were interviewed on site during May, 1979, using the MCMC Student Interview Form. Parents were interviewed by telephone during May-June, 1979, using the MCMC Parent Interview Form. DISD vocational and appraisal personnel were mailed an attitude survey in the last week of April, 1979, with 105 responding. Faculty attitudes were collected during interviews throughout the semester.

The final evaluation question concerned start-up activities:

8. What administrative tasks and/or procedures were used to initiate the MCMC and Assessment Center?

Interviews with project management and a review and synthesis of a paper written by the on-site administrator describing the start-up activities at William B. Carrell were used as the primary information sources. Additional information was obtained from other on-site staff.

Evaluation Results:

1. MCMC student body. Data pertaining to the student body were obtained from the Special Education data base as it existed June, 1979. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the MCMC, Assessment Center, and all DISD special education students at the secondary school level.

   Total enrollment for the spring semester was 64. The breakdown by handicapping condition reveals that the MCMC was serving primarily special education students who were mildly handicapped (97%). In fact, a majority of the students (58%) were either mentally retarded-educable or minimally brain injured. Only one orthopedically handicapped and one emotionally disturbed student were enrolled. No auditory-, visual-, or other health-impaired students were enrolled. Eight auditory handicapped students will be starting in the fall of 1979. Several health impaired students were referred and assessed, but they were eliminated because of safety factors. No visually handicapped student was referred.

   The MCMC distributions for sex and ethnicity were quite similar to the district distributions. The MCMC student body was 63% male. The ethnic representation was 48% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 45% White.

   The MCMC distributions for grade and age were somewhat different from the district distributions. The MCMC students ranged in age from 14 to 18 while the district high school special education students ranged in age from 13 to 22. Compared to District-wide special education enrollments, ninth and twelfth graders were under-represented while tenth and eleventh graders were over-represented. The over-representation of tenth and eleventh graders was intentional. According to state guidelines this is the optimal time for vocational training.

   Table 2 presents the home school distribution. An examination of that table reveals that the enrollment for the MCMC was distributed fairly evenly among many high schools with the largest enrollment coming from Kimball (11%). The DISD totals present the total enrollment of special education students in each home school. Comparing

Table 1

MCMC, Assessment Center and District-Wide High School
Special Education Student Characteristics

Characteristic	MCMC		Assessment Center[a]		DISD[b]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex						
Female	24	37.5	48	40.0	530	33.6
Male	40	62.5	72	60.0	1046	66.4
Ethnicity						
Black	31	48.4	59	49.2	732	46.4
Hispanic	4	6.3	7	5.8	118	7.5
White	29	45.3	54	45.0	719	45.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.5
Grade						
Ninth	16	25.0	38	32.5	587	37.2
Tenth	25	39.1	37	31.6	368	23.4
Eleventh	20	31.3	30	25.6	310	19.7
Twelfth	3	4.7	12	10.3	311	19.7
Age						
13 and Under	0	0.0	0	0.0	30	1.9
14	4	6.3	19	15.8	341	21.6
15	21	32.8	37	30.8	408	25.9
16	31	48.4	33	27.5	356	22.6
17	4	6.3	18	15.0	240	15.2
18	4	6.3	9	7.5	106	6.7
19	0	0.0	3	2.5	35	2.2
20	0	0.0	1	0.8	36	2.2
21 and Over	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	0.9
Primary Handicap						
Auditory-Regional School for Deaf (0092)	0	0.0	0	0.0	101	6.4
Visual (4041)	0	0.0	1	0.8	13	0.8
Orthopedic (4042)	1	1.6	5	4.2	37	2.3
Other health impaired (4043)	0	0.0	7	5.9	29	1.8
Minimally Brain Injured (4342)	7	10.9	5	4.2	67	4.3
Mentally Retarded-Educable (4444)	30	46.9	42	35.3	402	25.5
Mentally Retarded-Trainable (4544)	5	7.8	15	12.6	248	15.7
Emotionally Disturbed (4647, 4747)	1	1.6	12	10.1	140	8.9
Emotionally Disturbed in Community Center (4947)	0	0.0	1	0.8	101	6.4
Language and/or Learning Disabled (5251)	20	31.3	31	26.1	437	27.7
TOTAL	64		120		1576	

[a]The actual total under Assessment Center characteristic totals varies due to missing data.

[b]Represents all DISD Special Education secondary school students with the primary handicaps listed under primary handicap.

Table 2

Enrollment by Home School for the MCMC and DISD Secondary Special Education Population

Home School	MCMC		DISD Total[a] Special Education	
	N	%	N	%
Bryan Adams	4	6.3	46	4.7
W. H. Adamson	0	0.0	25	2.6
David W. Carter	6	9.4	57	5.9
EOC Complex	0	0.0	14	1.4
Hillcrest	1	1.6	70	7.2
Thomas Jefferson	3	4.7	36	3.7
Justin F. Kimball	7	10.9	46	4.7
Lincoln	5	7.8	38	3.9
James Madison	6	9.4	37	3.8
North Dallas	5	7.8	32	3.3
L. G. Pinkston	2	3.1	91	9.4
Franklin D. Roosevelt	2	3.1	31	3.2
W. W. Samuell	1	1.6	135	13.9
Seagoville	0	0.0	30	3.1
Skyline	4	6.3	53	5.5
South Oak Cliff	4	6.3	68	7.0
H. Grady Spruce	6	9.4	69	7.1
Sunset	3	4.7	32	3.3
W. T. White	3	4.7	22	2.3
Woodrow Wilson	2	3.1	40	4.1
TOTAL	64		972	

[a]Represents only the students enrolled in the above high schools and does not include students in community centers and magnet schools.

MCMC and DISD percentages, the following schools seemed over-represented: Kimball (11% MCMC vs. 5% DISD), Lincoln (8% MCMC vs. 4% DISD), Madison (9% MCMC vs. 4% DISD), and North Dallas (8% MCMC vs. 3% DISD). The following schools seemed under-represented: Hillcrest (2% MCMC vs. 7% DISD), Pinkston (3% vs. 9% DISD), and Samuell (2% vs. 14% DISD).

The presence of special programs might account for part of a school's lack of involvement in the programs available at the MCMC. The under-representation of Hillcrest might have been due to the on-site TMR (trainable mentally retarded) work activity center and the ED (emotionally disturbed) unit. Pinkston had several vocational units including a furniture repair unit for the disadvantaged which could account for its under-representation. Samuell had a large number of auditory-handicapped students (64) and the presence of the deaf education program could in part account for its under-representation.

Table 3 presents the sex, ethnicity and schedule for the career clusters. These variables were unevenly distributed across the clusters. For the morning clusters, Furniture Repair and General Construction were all male while Commercial Sewing/Housekeeping was all female. A similar pattern holds for the afternoon students. This pattern follows traditional sex stereotypes. For the morning, Furniture Repair was predominately Black (86%) while General Construction was predominately White (70%). The clusters were ethnically balanced in the afternoon with the exception of General Construction which was 67% Black.

Assessment Center client population. The Assessment Center provided vocational assessment for 120 special education students. A majority of these students was male (60%). The ethnic distribution was 49% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 45% White. Examination of Table 1 reveals that these figures were representative of the DISD Special Education sex and ethnic distributions.

The Assessment Center distribution by primary handicap was similar to the DISD Special Education distribution. Two important differences were noted. First, the Assessment Center had not assessed deaf students, and second, compared to the District population, the Assessment Center has assessed a rather high percentage of mentally retarded-educable students. The first deficit will soon be corrected since there were ten deaf education students scheduled for assessment during the summer.

Table 4 presents the number of referrals made to the Assessment Center by the home schools, the number of special education students at each high school, and the percentage of special education students referred for vocational assessment. The percentage of eligible students referred varied greatly among home schools. The following schools had a high referral rate to the Assessment Center: Lincoln (34%), Kimball (30%), EOC Complex (29%), Bryan Adams (26%), Jefferson (25%), Madison (24%), Roosevelt (23%), and Spruce (22%). The following schools had the smallest percentage of eligible students referred: Skyline (2%), Samuell (2%), Pinkston (4%), and Hillcrest (6%).

Table 3

MCMC Enrollment[a] by Career Cluster
by Time of Attendance,
Sex, and Ethnicity

	Morning Students					Afternoon Students					Cluster Totals					
	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	White	TOTAL
Furniture Repair and Upholstery	7	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	1	6	1	1	8
General Construction	10	0	1	2	7	6	0	4	0	2	16	0	5	2	9	16
Building and Grounds Maintenance	4	1	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	1	6	1	3	0	4	7
Laundry and Dry Cleaning	3	1	2	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	0	2	4
Food Service	2	5	5	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	4	7	7	0	4	11
Commercial Sewing/ Housekeeping	0	6	3	0	3	0	4	2	0	2	0	10	5	0	5	10
TOTALS	26	13	19	3	17	10	7	9	0	8	36	20	28	3	25	56

[a]These data were collected during April, 1979, and do not include those students staffed into the facility at a later date nor work adjustment students.

Table 4

Referrals to Assessment Center by Home School

Home School	Number of Eligible Students (Special Education)	Number Referred for Assessment	Percentage of Students Referred
Bryan Adams	46	12	26.1
W. H. Adamson	25	3	12.0
David W. Carter	57	5	8.8
EOC Complex	14	4	28.6
Hillcrest	70	4	5.7
Thomas Jefferson	36	9	25.0
J. F. Kimball	46	14	30.4
Lincoln	38	13	34.2
James Madison	37	9	24.3
North Dallas	32	4	12.5
L. G. Pinkston	91	4	4.4
Franklin D. Roosevelt	31	7	22.6
W. W. Samuell	135	2	1.5
Seagoville	30	2	6.7
Skyline	53	1	1.9
South Oak Cliff	68	7	10.3
H. Grady Spruce	69	15	21.7
Sunset	32	2	6.3
W. T. White	22	3	13.6
Woodrow Wilson	40	4	10.0

In an attempt to account for these differences, the data were broken down by assessment counselor assigned to the home school. Each assessment counselor served six or seven high schools and met with the home school Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) teams to decide which students would be referred. Thus the counselor's attitude could strongly affect how many students were referred. With the exception of Thomas Jefferson and EOC, all of the schools with high referral rates were assigned to one assessment counselor. At least part of the variance appeared to be due to the assessment counselor's willingness to assign students for referral. Other factors which could have contributed were home schools' willingness to refer to a "magnet" school, a desire to "dump" problem students on other programs, and a desire to help problem students.

MCMC and Assessment Center faculty demographics. Table 5 presents the relevant demographic characteristics. Of the six MCMC teachers, four were male and, ethnically, all were White. The average age was 45. Three of the vocational teachers were not college graduates but were teaching on vocational certificates. Two teachers had bachelor's degrees and one teacher had a master's degree. The average period of teaching and/or professional experience was 22.3 years.

Of the six Assessment Center staff members, two were male. The one Black, four White, and one Hispanic assessment staff members had an average age of 35. Three of the staff had master's degrees while the other three had doctorates. The average period of teaching and/or professional experience was 7.3 years.

2. The MCMC Task Force was chaired by Bill Wetsel, corporate personnel director of Texas Instruments. Other members of the committee included Jerry Cooper, Henry Beck Company; Tom Haden, executive director, Dale Wore; Dave Harmon, compensation manager, E Systems; Dub Hill, executive director, Building Owners and Managers Association; D. H. Howell, handicap program specialist, Office of Human Development, City of Dallas; Gene Sparks, Foster Cleaners; Bob Varnell, director of human resources, Vought Corporation; and Troy B. Williams, John K. Burch Company. This committee has held three meetings. Following an overall inspection of the facility, the committee noted that the current vocational clusters were heavily service-oriented and recommended that future expansion of the program be in non-service areas. The committee also made recommendations for the membership of the subcommittees for each vocational cluster.

   The advisory committee for the Laundry and Dry Cleaning cluster held four meetings and included Gene Sparks (Chairperson), Foster Cleaners; Beatrice Brinkley, Dallas Laundry and Dry Cleaning Association; Carlton Coburn, Holiday Cleaning and Laundry; Gene Coleman, Coleman's OHM; Charles Grant, Fishburn's; Jason Hill, Turk's Craftsman Cleaners; Felix Parker, Texas Laundry and Dry Cleaning

Table 5

MCMC and Assessment Center
Faculty Demographics

Characteristic	MCMC		AC	
	N	%	N	%
Sex				
Female	2	33.3	4	66.7
Male	4	66.7	2	33.3
Ethnicity				
Black	0	0.0	1	16.7
Hispanic	0	0.0	1	16.7
White	6	100.0	4	66.7
Age				
30 and Under	1	16.7	2	33.3
31-35	1	16.7	1	16.7
36-40	1	16.7	2	33.3
41-50	1	16.7	1	16.7
51-60	1	16.7	0	0.0
61-70	1	16.7	0	0.0
Degree				
High School (Vocational Certificate)	3	50.0	0	0.0
Bachelor	2	33.3	0	0.0
Master	1	16.7	3	50.0
Doctorate	0	0.0	3	50.0
Teaching and/or Professional Experience				
1-5 Years	0	0.0	2	33.3
6-10	2	33.3	4	66.6
11-15	1	16.7	0	0.0
16-20	0	0.0	0	0.0
21-25	0	0.0	0	0.0
26-30	1	16.7	0	0.0
31 or more	2	33.3	0	0.0

Association; David Shumaker, Valet Cleaners; and Florene Turner, Flo's Cleaners. This subcommittee helped with the design of the facility and advised concerning which equipment to purchase. The members also volunteered the services of 30 professional dry cleaners as part-time teachers in the cluster.

The advisory committee for the Building and Grounds Maintenance cluster included: Dub Hill (Chairperson), executive director, Building Owners and Managers Association; and R. D. Noble, chief engineer, Sanders Campbell Properties. This committee volunteered to help find job placements for MCMC students.

Troy B. Williams of the John K. Burch Company accepted the position of chairperson for the Furniture Repair and Upholstery cluster. He volunteered to find short-term non-paid internships for the MCMC students. The rest of the committee has yet to be formed. No other subcommittees had been formed as of July, 1979.

3. The curricular experiences available at the MCMC are listed by career cluster in Table 6. Even though the program only began instruction during January, most clusters offered many of the scheduled activities. The dry cleaning cluster had a later starting date in May, 1979. Most of the equipment in this cluster was steam operated and, since the safety valves for the boiler were not installed, the dry cleaning equipment was not functional. The furniture repair section of the Furniture Repair and Upholstery cluster and the non-carpentry sections of the General Construction cluster have yet to be initiated.

4. Regular magnet school buses were used for transportation. As part of student management, a record of arrival and departure times was maintained for both morning and afternoon students. Since buses were identified in this record, it was possible to determine whether magnet buses were punctual in delivering and picking up students. Table 7 presents the percentage of times the home school buses were late and the average period of time that the buses were late for students attending the MCMC in the morning. Table 8 presents the same information for students attending the MCMC in the afternoon.

   An examination of Table 7 reveals that there were relatively minor problems transporting morning students. The Kimball, Spruce, and W. T. White buses delivered students late at least 32% of the time. The North Dallas and Skyline buses picked up students late 43% and 26% of the time, respectively.

   An examination of Table 8 reveals that for afternoon students there were severe scheduling problems. With few exceptions, afternoon students were delivered 30 or more minutes late and, in many cases, were picked up 50 or more minutes late. In addition, the afternoon students always had approximately an hour wait before the buses began the trip back to the home schools. This hour was spent either in the building or on the bus. Magnet buses make a circuit of all magnet schools before beginning the trip to the home schools; thus,

Table 6

MCMC Career Cluster Activities[a]

Career Cluster	Cluster Activities
Building and Grounds Maintenance	Cleaning: dusting, sweeping, window washing, carpet cleaning, floor waxing Gardening: site selection, soil preparation, planting, pruning, grass cutting, raking Plumbing: cutting and threading pipe, changing washers, clearing drains with auger Carpentry: door hanging, sheetrocking, wall paneling, puttying Electrical repairs: changing fuses, flourescent and incandescent lights, splicing wire Painting and paper hanging Glazing: cutting and installing plexiglass, replacing damaged screens
Dry Cleaning and Laundry	Sorting clothing Use of commercial washing machine Spot removal Use of hand press for ironing
Furniture Repair and Upholstery	Sewing blind stitch Measuring and cutting fabric Making slip covers and furniture buttons Placing buttons Spring tying Use of all upholstery tools
General Construction[b]	General carpentry: Use of hand tools such as claw hammer, folding rule, plane, screwdriver, spirit level and framing square Identifying construction woods and their uses Flooring, wall construction, roofing, wall covering, molding and finishing.
Food Service	Equipment usage: industrial dishwasher, electric and gas range, confection oven, food warmer, commerical food mixer, microwave range, freezer, waffle iron, and cash register

[a]Though not listed, all students had considerable exposure to relevant safety rules and their respective vocational vocabulary.

Table 6 (Cont'd.)

	General skills: knowledge of proportioning in foods, weighing and measuring ingredients, reading recipes, sanitation, serving guests, setting tables, busing, filling out job applications, computing weekly salary, and handling money
Commercial Sewing/ Homemaking	Sewing: using home and power machines, using shears, laying out and measuring patterns Home laundry: sorting clothing, spot removal, use of washer and dryer, ironing Home cleaning: dishes, carpeting, windows, refrigerator, dusting, cleaning bathroom, bedroom and kitchen Personal hygiene and grooming

---

[b]Students applied their general carpentry skills to successfully complete and sell a pre-fabricated storage shed. The non-carpentry sections were not introduced due to the late program start. These skills include cement work, bricklaying, cabinet making, and simple electrical wiring.

Table 7

Morning Arrival and Departure Times

Home School	Arrival		Departure	
	Late[a] (%)	Mean Late Arrival Time	Late[b] (%)	Mean Late Departure Time
Bryan Adams	0	-	3	12:46 p.m.
Buckner (Skyline)	12	9:22 a.m.	26	12:36 p.m.
Hillcrest	0	-	4	12:33 p.m.
Justin F. Kimball	33	9:21 a.m.	0	-
Lincoln	0	-	3	12:45 p.m.
James Madison	8	9:20 a.m.	0	-
North Dallas	0[c]	-	43	12:30 p.m.
H. Grady Spruce	32	9:20 a.m.	10	12:41 p.m.
Thomas Jefferson	6	9:35 a.m.	6	12:40 p.m.
W. T. White	32	9:26 a.m.	0	-

[a] Even though class was scheduled at 9:00 a.m., a liberal approach was taken and a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 9:15 a.m.

[b] Officially, departure time was noon, but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it departed after 12:15 p.m.

[c] The North Dallas bus arrived before 8:45 a.m. 74% of the time. It has arrived as early as 8:00 a.m.

Table 8

Afternoon Arrival and Departure Times

Home School	Arrival		Departure	
	Late[a] (%)	Mean Late Arrival Time	Late[b] (%)	Mean Late Departure Time
Bryan Adams	75	12:56 p.m.	22	4:37 p.m.
Buckner (Skyline)	97	1:14 p.m.	8	4:55 p.m.
Justin F. Kimball	17	12:52 p.m.	16	4:32 p.m.
James Madison	31	12:56 p.m.	42	4:26 p.m.
L. G. Pinkston	94	12:59 p.m.	61	3:54 p.m.
Franklin D. Roosevelt	97	1:02 p.m.	87	4:16 p.m.
H. Grady Spruce	89	1:03 p.m.	100	4:28 p.m.
Thomas Jefferson	14	12:54 p.m.	48	3:54 p.m.
Woodrow Wilson	0	-	86	4:33 p.m.

[a] Arrival time was scheduled for 12:30 p.m., but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 12:45 p.m.

[b] Departure time was scheduled for 3:30 p.m., but for the purposes of this report, a bus was not considered late unless it arrived after 3:45 p.m.

William B. Carrell's position in the circuit determined how much time was spent in the building and how much time was spent on the bus. When a home school bus making the circuit of magnet schools stopped at William B. Carrell at the beginning of its circuit, the students spent their hour's wait in the building. When a home school bus stopped at William B. Carrell at the end of its circuit, the students spent their hour's wait on the bus making the circuit. At least part of the problem derived from the fact that the students at William B. Carrell had a scheduled afternoon departure time of 3:30 p.m., thirty minutes earlier than any other magnet school. On the basis of this information, the afternoon schedule for 1979-80 has been changed to 1 p.m.-4 p.m.

No other problem was reported by the staff. Interviews with parents revealed that, although they were aware of the time their children left and returned home, they were generally not aware of the problems encountered in the transportation of their children to and from the home schools to the magnet school.

5. The Individual Educational Programs (IEP) were completed and instructionally functional in April, 1979. A random sample of 30 IEPs were inspected for the technical quality of the objectives listed for each student. The objectives listed were checked for the presence of a terminal behavior, observational method, behavioral criterion, initiation date and attainment date. Not all the objectives incorporated these criteria. The strongest technical aspect of the IEPs was the presence of a terminal behavior defining the student objective. For 27 (90%) of the IEPs, all the objectives listed a terminal behavior. The weakest technical aspect of IEPs was the listing of an attainment date. For 18 (60%) of the IEPs, defect was due to teachers assuming that the end of the year was the attainment date (unless otherwise stated). The objectives listed on the IEP seem to be realistic estimates of student's potential. That the objectives were attained was verified by on-site visits of the classroom, student interviews (see Table 9, item 3), and conversations with the student counselor.

6. Student, parent, and faculty attitudes towards the MCMC were highly favorable. During May of 1979, 28 students were randomly chosen for interviews. Table 9 presents the student interview form with a breakdown of student responses to each question. The students were happy in school: 96% liked their teacher; 89% felt the teacher liked them; 92% were happy in their career cluster, and 92% would want their friends to be able to go to the MCMC. When the students were asked what their parents thought of them being in their career cluster, 57% responded that their parents liked the cluster while 11% responded that their parents felt that the cluster was all right.

Several questions gathered data on the student's job related attitudes. For students planning to get a job after graduation, 18 (82%) students plan to get a job in the career cluster area while 4 (18%) plan to get a job in a non-career area. Four students had no job plans. For the 19 students answering why they were happy to be in their cluster, the following responses were given:

Table 9

MCMC Student Interviews

N	%	Interview Question[a] and Subject Response[b]
		1. Do you like _____ as a teacher?
27	96	YES
1	4	NO
		2. Does _____ (cluster teacher) like you?
11	39	YES (unmodified response by student)
14	50	YES (I GUESS SO, I THINK)
1	4	NO
2	7	no response
		3. What have you learned in your cluster? Can you show something you have learned to do?
		The following list is organized by cluster. Each line represents a different student's answer.

Clothing and home laundry student response:

USE WASHING MACHINE, CLEAN BATHROOM; GENERAL CLEANING.
LAUNDRY, SEW CORRECTLY, GENERAL CLEANING, MAKE-UP CARE.
STITCHING, MAKING PURSE & APRON, IRONING, CLEANING, GROOMING.
OPERATE COMMERCIAL SEWING MACHINE, HEMMING, MAKING CLOTHES.
SEWING, GENERAL CLEANING, CLEAN BATHROOM.

Building and Grounds Maintenance student response:

REMOVING PAINT.
PUT DOWN CARPET, GARDENING, USE BUFFER, CLEAN BATHROOMS.
no response.

General Construction Trades student response:

USE TOOLS, PULL WALLS, MAKE FIREWALL, STUDS AND TABLES.
PUT HOUSE TOGETHER, USE EQUIPMENT, SAFETY RULES, SHARPEN AND CLEAN TOOLS.
PUT HOUSE TOGETHER, USE TOOLS.
CUT STRAIGHT LINE, NAIL STRAIGHT, READ RULER, DRAW PLAN, DO ROOF.
USE BALANCE, PUT THINGS TOGETHER.
HOW TO MEASURE, PUT THINGS TOGETHER, NAME TOOLS, MAKE CUTS, WORK WITH OTHER PEOPLE.
no response

[a] The interview questions are italicized. Interpretive comments to the reader are in standard lower-case type.

[b] Student responses are in upper-case standard type.

Table 9 (Cont'd.)

N	%	
		Laundry and Dry Cleaning student response:
		LEARN HOW TO PRESS PANTS & SHIRTS, SPOTTING (SPOT REMOVAL), WASHING, TAKING CLOTHES IN.
		IRONING.
		Furniture Repair and Upholstery student response:
		FIXING CHAIRS, USE TACK HAMMER, MAKE BUTTONS.
		PUT CHAIRS TOGETHER, UPHOLSTERY, USE TACK HAMMER & TACK KNUCKLE TO REMOVE TACKS, MAKE BUTTONS.
		PUT CHAIRS TOGEGETHER, USE TACK HAMMER, USE CLAMP.
		no response
		Food Service student response:
		COOK MEXICAN FOOD, COOK CAKES, MAKE COOKIES, SOUP & SPAGHETTI.
		COOKING, USE STOVE.
		KNOW HOW MUCH (INGREDIENTS) TO PUT IN, (USE) MEASURING CUPS, MIXING, (USE) POTS, PANS AND DISHES.
		SET TABLES, MAKE BETTER FOODS, DO DISHES.
		MEASURE, WEIGH, LEARN NEW RECIPIES, HOW TO SEASON MEATS.
		Work Adjustment student response:
		MAKE JEWELRY, COOK, SEW.
		no response.
		4. Are you happy to be in _____ cluster? Why?
26	92	YES
1	4	NO
1	4	no response
		Of the 26 students who responded that they were happy in their cluster, the following reasons were given:
8	31	I AM LEARNING A TRADE.
7	27	IT IS FUN (in the cluster).
2	8	I AM LEARNING (work) SKILLS.
1	4	I LIKE THE TEACHER.
1	4	I LIKE THE STUDENTS.
7	27	no response.
		5. Would you want your friends to go here too?
26	92	YES
2	8	NO
		6. What are you planning to do when you get out of school permanently?
18	69	PLAN TO GET JOB IN CAREER CLUSTER AREA.

[c]Two Work Adjustment students were not included since they were not in a career cluster.

Table 9 (Cont'd.)

N	%	
4	15	PLAN TO GET JOB IN NON-CAREER CLUSTER AREA.
4	15	NO PLAN.
		7. *If you had your choice, would you rather continue in school or quit and go to work now?*
16	57	CONTINUE IN SCHOOL.
10	36	QUIT AND WORK.
2	7	no response
		8. *If you were allowed, would you rather stay in _____(present cluster) or get into another cluster? Where?*
20	71	STAY.
5	18	GO.
3	11	no response
		9. *How did you choose this school?*
2	7	VAC RECOMMENDATION.
12	43	HOMESCHOOL TEACHER RECOMMENDATION.
9	32	HOMESCHOOL COUNSELOR RECOMMENDATION.
1	4	PARENT'S CHOICE
4	14	no response
		10. *Do you currently work? Where?*
9	32	YES
19	68	NO
		For the nine students who currently work, four work in their career cluster area.
		11. *What does your father do for a living? What does your mother do for a living?*
7	25	Students with a parent working in student's career cluster area.
17	61	Students with parents working in an area not related.
4	14	no response.
		12. *What do your parents think of your being in this cluster?*
16	57	THEY LIKE IT
3	11	OK
9	32	DO NOT KNOW

Table 9 (Cont'd.)

For the students reporting that their parents liked them being in the cluster, the following comments were volunteered:

MOTHER WANTS ME TO GET A TRADE.

FATHER THINKS IT IS GOOD TO LEARN A TRADE.

FATHER LIKES BECAUSE I CAN HELP AROUND HOUSE (general construction student).

IT IS GOOD TO BE ABLE TO BUILD HOUSE.

BEST THING FOR ME.

THEY WANT ME TO HAVE A TRADE.

(a) 8 (42%) that they were learning a trade; (b) 2 (11%) that they were learning useful work skills; and (c) 7 (37%) that the cluster activities were fun. Only 10 students responded that they would quit because they thought they could get a job with the cluster training they had already received. One of the assessment counselors expressed a fear that students might choose a cluster because it was the only area to which they had been exposed (e.g., a person might choose the General Construction cluster because his father was a carpenter). A similar idea was expressed by a parent concerned about the appropriateness of his daughter training to be a janitor such as himself. To examine this notion, students were asked what their father and mother did for a living. Of those students who were aware of their parents' profession, 29% had a parent working in a cluster related area; therefore, there was support for that idea.

Interviews with parents revealed that they were pleased with the MCMC. When asked whether they would recommend the school to other parents, 90% responded positively, and 10% responded that it was too early to know. In general, parents recommended the MCMC because (a) their children were happy, (b) teachers were interested in their children, and/or, (c) their children were learning a trade. Most parents felt that their children were better behaved, had better attitudes, or were more self-confident due to their experiences at the MCMC.

Much of the positive parent and student attitudes probably derived from this warm atmosphere. Teachers knew all the students in the building by name. They were concerned about the welfare of the students (as revealed by teacher conversations during break periods). Students were encouraged to be independent and to achieve to their limits. Project management encouraged this atmosphere in order to achieve self-growth and self-esteem in students.

7. Professionals (105) from several disciplines completed the MCMC and Assessment Center Survey, and for the purposes of this question, they were divided into the following three groups: (a) 31 area professionals including administrators, coordinators, special educational and occupational facilitators, area level counselors, home-school coordinators, and psychologists; (b) 57 local professionals including diagnosticians and local level counselors, home-school coordinators, and psychologists; and (c) 17 vocational teachers including vocational adjustment coordinators and work activity teachers. All respondents knew the site location. All of the teachers, 90% of the area professionals, and 67% of local professionals had visited William B. Carrell since its renovation, and only 43% of the local professionals were aware of the transportation stipulation which required that MCMC students be bused from their neighborhood high schools. Only orthopedically handicapped students were bused directly from their homes to school.

   Concerning program guidelines, most of the teachers (94%) and nearly two-thirds of the local and area professionals (63% and 65%, respectively) responded that they knew that the Assessment Center was designed to evaluate students' ability to benefit from <u>any</u> district-wide vocational program. An MCMC policy states that students must be enrolled in the program for three consecutive quarters. When asked whether this restricted the number of referable students, the responses were evenly divided between "yes" and "no" indicating no consistent pattern relative to this question. A similar inconsistent opinion pattern was evidenced when the professionals were asked whether the vocational programs at the MCMC limited the number of eligible students that could be referred.

   Concerning communications, the majority of the professionals responded that they were receiving literature about the MCMC. Although 86% of the local professionals stated that they had received literature about the MCMC, only 58% stated that they felt knowledgeable about the program. When asked whether they had received feedback on students in vocational units at the MCMC, about half of the local professionals (45%) and about two-thirds of the teachers (64%) replied positively. The fact that teachers received more feedback than local professionals could have resulted from the fact the local professionals did not see students on a routine, daily basis. A similar pattern of responses was evidenced when the professionals were asked whether they had received feedback on students in the Assessment Center.

8. <u>Renovation of the facility</u>. Renovation was delayed by a lack of overall planning. Three different renovation plans were drawn up by administrators responsible for different aspects of the program (e.g., VEH units, homemaking units, and special education classrooms). When the on-site administrator was appointed in September, 1978, she found that the renovation was managed by several departments (such as heating, electrical, and plumbing) and the on-the-job foremen felt that their job was to implement the plans--not make decisions. She also found that the workmen needed information on

the size and electrical requirements of capital equipment (110 volt versus 220 volt system). This information could only be obtained from Purchasing. These two factors often caused work stoppages.

Conflicts between renovation plans were resolved when an architect was assigned to integrate the separate renovation plans following a meeting between all on-site supervisors, the Assistant Superintendent of Support Services, and the on-site administrator. To resolve questions concerning capital equipment, the on-site administrator ordered copies of all plans, specifications, purchase orders, and bids.

Student academics. Students attended the MCMC in either the morning or afternoon. But since special education academics (e.g., English, Reading, Math, History, Science) are traditionally offered in the morning, it was suspected that students attending the MCMC in the morning might be missing their academics. An examination of home school academics revealed that for students attending the MCMC in the morning, 27% had no academic class, 36% had one academic class, and the remaining 37% had two or more academic classes. In sharp contrast to these figures, for students attending the MCMC in the afternoon, 100% had at least one academic class while 87% had two or more academic classes. Following the transmission of this information to Special Education Administrative personnel steps were initiated toward increasing the availability of basic academic instruction.